

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figure 5 is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. The drawing figure has been amended. Appended to this amendment is an annotated copy of the previous drawing sheet which has been marked to show changes presented in the replacement sheet of the drawing.

The specific change which has been made to Figure 5 is the removal of the reference character “**14**”.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added.

Claims 1, 12 and 17 are currently being canceled.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15 and 16 are currently being amended.

This amendment and reply cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After canceling and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 2-7, 9, 10, 13, 15 and 16 are now pending in this application for examination on the merits, whereby claims 8, 11 and 14 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected species.

Drawings and Specification Objections:

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because the reference character "**14**" in Figure 5 is not described in the specification. Due to the removal of the reference character "**14**" from Figure 5, this objection is now moot.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to because of an informality noted on page 4 of the Office Action. The specification has been amended to correct this informality.

Claim Rejections –35 USC 112:

In the Office Action, claims 2-7, 9, 10, 13 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons set forth on pages 4-13 of the Office Action.

In reply, with respect to the numerous “indefiniteness” issues raised in the Office Action with respect to independent claims 2 and 13 as “being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements”, those claims had previously been amended to merely place those claims in independent form, and no “indefiniteness” issues were

previously raised in any previous Office Actions with respect to those claims. In any event, independent claims 2 and 13 have been amended to address the indefiniteness issues raised in the Office Action.

With respect to the numerous “indefiniteness” issues raised in the Office Action with respect to dependent claims 3-5 as “being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements”, those claims have not previously been amended substantively (claim 4 was merely amended to change its dependency from claim 1 to claim 2), and no “indefiniteness” issues were previously raised in any previous Office Actions with respect to those claims. In any event, dependent claims 3-5 have been amended to address the indefiniteness issues raised in the Office Action.

With respect to the indefiniteness rejection of claims 2, 7, 9, 13, 15 and 17 for the use of the word “predetermined”, that word is not improper for use in apparatus claims such as the presently pending claims, since the fact that a scan line has been predetermined beforehand is not contrary to the features recited in those claims. In any event, to expedite prosecution, the claims have been amended to remove the word “predetermined”, and to replace it with a word (e.g., “first” or “second”) that should not pose a problem with the Examiner.

Accordingly, all of the presently pending claims are believed to fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Given that the “indefiniteness” rejection of certain claims has been raised for the first time at this “after final” stage, and this was not due to claim amendments made by Applicants, it is respectfully requested that any further Office Action be made non-final.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,028,577 to Sakamoto. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

With respect to presently pending independent claim 2, Sakamoto did not disclose or suggest that “the second drain electrode (of the second switching device) is electrically connected to **the first gate electrode** (of the first switching device)”, as recited in claim 2. Rather, Sakamoto discloses that the drain electrode of the second switching device (see

Figure 10B; 6(i, j-1)) is electrically connected to **a third pixel electrode** (see Fig. 10B; 1(i, j-1)).

Still further, Sakamoto also did not disclose or suggest that "the second source electrode (of the second switching device) is electrically connected to **the first scan line**", as recited in claim 2. Rather, Sakamoto discloses that the source electrode of the second switching device (see Fig. 10B; 6(i, j-1)) is electrically connected to **a second data line** (see Fig. 10B; 3(j-1)).

Also, Sakamoto does not disclose or suggest that "the second gate electrode (of the second switching device) is electrically connected to **the second scan line**", as recited in claim 2. Rather, Sakamoto discloses that the gate electrode of the second switching device (see Fig. 10B; 6(i, j-1)) is electrically connected to **the first scan line** (see Fig. 10B; 2(i)).

In other words, Sakamoto did not disclose or suggest the second switching device as recited in presently pending independent claim 2, and therefore claim 2 is not anticipated by Sakamoto.

With respect to presently pending independent claim 13, that claim is patentable for similar reasons as given above with respect to claim 2.

The presently pending dependent claims are patentable due to their respective dependencies on either claim 2 or claim 13, as well as for the specific features recited in those dependent claims.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 21, 2008

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5426
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Glenn Law
Registration No. 34,371

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819